

25X1

DOC	10	REV DATE	28/3/80	BY	
ORIG COMP	11	OPI	11	TYPE	02
ORIG CLASS	C	PAGES	3	REV CLASS	C
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2010	AUTH	HR 78-2

3 December 1957

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : Policy Concerning Language Development Awards

1. On 31 October 1957 the Committee on Language Development considered the first group of applications for Language Achievement Awards. Before taking up the individual cases, the Committee found it necessary to restate and agree upon the policies--or rather, the interpretations of the policy expressed in Regulation [] and related Notices--which should govern decisions in each case. On the motion of the DD/I member

25X1A

25X1A [], the Committee accepted the following ground rules:

- a. The amount of an achievement award will be the difference between the sum payable for the initial level of proficiency and the amount authorized for the next level achieved.
- b. The total amount for a series of achievement awards will not exceed the amount specified in Notice [] to be awarded for attainment of the highest levels of proficiency in the language.
- c. A candidate can receive an award for only one element of specialized proficiency at one time in a language.
- d. An achievement award for directed language training shall be one-half the amount payable for achievement through voluntary training.

25X1A

To illustrate, if Candidate X started with comprehensive proficiency at the intermediate level in Japanese, a Group III language, and progressed in a given year to high comprehensive proficiency, his achievement award would be \$600 if his training was voluntary, and \$300 if directed.

25X1A

2. In the next meeting of the Committee on 21 November, the O/Pers member [], who had missed the previous meeting, dissented

SUBJECT: Policy Concerning Language Development Awards

from these policy interpretations. He felt strongly that the Career Council had intended that achievement awards be paid on a cumulative basis, e. g., that the maximum award for going from zero proficiency to high comprehensive would be the sum of the three stages. In the case of Group III languages this would mean a maximum achievement award possibility of \$2100 instead of \$1200. It was his view, shared by the DD/P member , that the more restrictive interpretation might provide too little incentive over the years for "a man to work at learning a language from scratch." He felt that the Career Council had intended to be as liberal as possible so as to offer maximum inducement. In view of his position, payment of the first group of awards has been held up until the policy question can be resolved.

3. Outlined below are representative cases considered by the Committee thus far, with the amounts which would be payable under each of these interpretations. All were directed training. Awards payable under the Committee's restrictive interpretation are identified as Awards A, and under the liberal interpretation, as Awards B.

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Achievement</u>	<u>Language</u>	<u>Award A</u>	<u>Award B</u>
1.	Intermediate to high, Specialized	Japanese	\$200	\$600
2.	Intermediate to high, Comprehensive	German	\$100	\$200
3.	Elem. to intermediate, Comprehensive	German	\$50	\$100
4.	Elem. to intermediate, Specialized	German	\$25	\$50
5.	Intermediate to high, Specialized	French	\$50	\$100
6.	Elem. to intermediate, Specialized	Japanese	\$100	\$200
7.	Elem. to intermediate, Specialized	German	\$25	\$50

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Policy Concerning Language Development Awards

25X1A 4. The question is one of interpretation of the schedule of awards outlined in Notice The principle that equal awards should be given for equal achievement remains unaffected, i. e. , two people who achieve the same level of proficiency will receive the same total of awards, whether earned in a series of steps or in one lump sum. The question is whether the maximum achievement awards available for the highest levels of proficiency should be \$400, \$800, and \$1200, or \$700, \$1400, and \$2100.

5. The Committee requests your guidance with respect to the Career Council's intentions, and the policy which should govern the determination of awards to be paid. If you feel that the original intent of the program will not be destroyed thereby, I recommend that the more restrictive interpretation of the Committee be approved.

25X1A

Chairman, Language Development Committee

CONFIDENTIAL